



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,856	02/27/2002	Douglas U. Mennie	247171-000373USD1	6222
41230	7590	04/29/2010	EXAMINER	
CUMMINS-ALLISON CORP. C/O NIXON PEABODY LLP 300 S. Riverside Plaza 16th Floor CHICAGO, IL 60606				SWARTZ, JAMIE H
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3684				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/29/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
2

3

4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES
6

7

8 *Ex parte* DOUGLAS U. MENNIE,
9 WILLIAM J. JONES, and
10 MARK C. MUNRO
11

12

13 Appeal 2009-006570
14 Application 10/084,856
15 Technology Center 3600
16

17

18 Decided: April 28, 2010
19

20

21 Before HUBERT C. LORIN, ANTON W. FETTING, and BIBHU R. MOHANTY,
22 *Administrative Patent Judges.*

23 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

24 DECISION ON REQUEST FOR REHEARING
25

1 STATEMENT OF THE CASE

2 The Appellants filed a REQUEST FOR REHEARING on March 1, 2010.

3 The Examiner rejected claims 258-261 and 267-270 under 35 U.S.C. § 112,
4 first and second paragraphs. We reversed these rejections in our Decision issued
5 December 28, 2009.

6 The Examiner further rejected claims 258-261 and 267-270 under 35 U.S.C.
7 § 103(a) as unpatentable over Smith and Avnet. We affirmed these rejections in
8 our December 28, 2009 Decision.

9 The Appellants seek reconsideration of the decision to affirm these
10 rejections.

11 We DENY the REQUEST FOR REHEARING.

12 ISSUES

13 The issue pertinent to this request is whether the Appellants have sustained
14 their burden of showing that we misapprehended the art and thus erred in
15 sustaining the rejections of claims. 37 C.F.R. 41.52(a)(1).

16 The pertinent issue turns on whether Smith describes the step of singulating the
17 bulk coins using a coin separation device.

18 ANALYSIS

19 We found in our decision

20 The Appellants have not sustained the burden of showing that the
21 Examiner erred in rejecting claims 258-261 and 267-270 under 35
22 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Smith and Avnet.

23 Decision 15

24 The Appellants argue Smith fails to describe singulating the bulk coins using a
25 coin separation device (Request 2-7). The Appellants agree that that “singulating”

1 means “to make single and not commingled with other coins” (Decision 10 and
2 Request 3). However, Appellants contend that Smith fails to describe singulating
3 *using a coin separation device*. Smith further fails to require a structure to
4 singulate (Request 3). We begin by pointing out that Smith describes a structure
5 for accepting coins (Decision 6: FF 04-05). This structural slot only allows for a
6 single coin to be inserted at a time (Decision 6: FF 04-05). Although the user is
7 inserting the coins, the structure of the coin acceptor is singulating the coins as
8 they are inserted. If a user were to attempt to insert several coins into the device,
9 the coin acceptor would only allow a single coin to be accepted. This context and
10 definition of singulation is the same context and definition used in the claimed
11 invention. As such, the Appellants’ argument that Smith fails to describe a device
12 or structure that singulates using a coin separation device is not found persuasive.

13 The Appellants also argue that the claimed invention is distinguished from
14 Smith because the claimed invention utilizes a hopper to receive coins and a
15 sorting head to singulate coins in contrast to Smith’s coin acceptor (Request 3-6).
16 However, these features that the Appellants are arguing to distinguish the claimed
17 invention from Smith are not recited in the claim language. As such, this argument
18 is not found persuasive.

19 The Appellants additionally argue that Avnet fails to describe singulating using
20 a coin separation device (Request 6-8). However, this argument is not found
21 persuasive because the Appellants are attacking the reference individually, even
22 though the rejection is based on the combined teachings of the references.
23 Nonobviousness cannot be established by attacking the references individually
24 when the rejection is predicated upon a combination of prior art disclosures. *See In*
25 *re Merck & Co. Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 1097, 231 USPQ 375, 380 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The Appellants further contend that we applied inconsistent definitions for a bulk coin receptacle (Request 8-12). The Appellants specifically argue that we correctly defined a bulk coin receptacle as a structure capable of *holding* a plurality of coins and then incorrectly applied a definition for this term as a structure capable of *receiving* a plurality of coins with respect to Smith's description of a coin acceptor (Request 9-10). The Appellants further provide the rationale that distinguishes *holding* and *receiving* coins is that the specification describes that the separation of the coins is done subsequent to the loading of coins (Request 11).

e point out that the limitation [1] of claim 1 recites the receiving of bulk coins in
ulk coin receptacle. As such, claim 1 requires that the proper definition for a
lk coin receptacle is a coin accepter that receives coins, not the loading or
lding of coins. The additional features of holding or loading coins are not
imed. Therefore, this argument is not found persuasive since these limitations
not found in the claim language.

For the above reasons we are not convinced of reversible error in our decision. Accordingly, the Appellants' request for rehearing is denied.

DECISION

To summarize, our decision is as follows:

- We have considered the REQUEST FOR REHEARING.
 - We DENY the request that we reverse the Examiner as to claims 258-261 and 267-270.
 - The rejection of claims 258-261 and 267-270 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Smith and Avnet remains sustained.

Appeal 2009-006570
Application 10/084,856

DENIED

6 Address
7 CUMMINS-ALLISON CORP.
8 C/O NIXON PEABODY LLP
9 300 S. RIVERSIDE PLAZA, 16TH FLOOR
10 CHICAGO IL 60606